2: Henry E-5 (1932-1934) 1941
SM3 Caingang SM3
Aweikoma

Conclusions[17]

462 474 In spite of the incomplete character of the data some valid inferences can be made.

(1) Industries are overwhelmingly in the hands of the men, from the standpoint both of number and of importance. Before the raids on the settlers made pottery and clothing manufacture unnecessary the part played by women in the economy was somewhat more important than later when conditions made their techniques unimportant. The following table may make this clearer:

Industry	*Male*	*Female*
Hunting (CI)[18]	+	
Fruit gathering (I)	[+]*	+
Pine nuts (CI)	+	+
Honey gathering (CI)	+	[+]
Beer (C)	+	+
Cooking (I)		+
Fire making (CI)	+	
Houses (CI)	+	+
Bows (I)	+	
Arrows (I)	+	
Lances (CI)	+	
Clubs (I)	+	
Troughs (C)	+	
Mortars (I)	+	
Pestles (I)	+	[+]
Baskets (I)	+	
Spinning (I)	[+]	+
Robes (I)		+
Shirts (I)		+
Pots (I)		+
Carrying-bands (for infants) (I)		+
Dance ornaments (I)	+	
Lip plugs (I)	+	
Raiding Brazilians (C)	+	

The only important industry controlled by women was pottery, and when raiding the Brazilians loomed up as a new economic technique,

[17] My data on weaving and pottery are so scanty that I have not included them here.

[18] C=Industries that are organized cooperatively; I=industries that are individualistic; CI=industries that are sometimes cooperative and sometimes individualistic.

* Brackets represent participation in a minor way.

2: Henry E-5 (1932-1934) 1941
SM3 Caingang SM3
Aweikoma

462-474 marize once more the attitudes and the procedures that express this cooperation, which reaches its highest expression in the prosecution of the feuds. The search for food and the institutions of polyandry and joint marriage supply additional occasions for cooperation. Actually what we have in Kaingáng society is a large number of individualistic techniques employed within a social framework that is essentially cooperative.

2: Henry E-5 (1932-1934) 1941
SM3 Caingang SM3
Aweikoma

women's role in Kaingáng economy became insignificant. They continued to make their contributions, it is true, but these were small compared to men's.

(2) Although most of the techniques seem better suited to an individual working alone, whenever circumstances become exigent several individuals cooperate, as, for example, in the making of lances and troughs and the hunting of tapir with dogs.

In general, the way in which each industry is practised is inherent in the natural conditions under which it is maintained. Tapir hunting is both cooperative and individualistic but fails to achieve the maximum cooperation because the Kaingáng are unable to put into effect the elaborate technique necessary for killing tapir in the *carreira*, the best way of hunting tapir. Peccary are usually surrounded, but they may also be pursued by a lone hunter although surrounding is unquestionably the best means of taking them. The only way the Kaingáng killed deer under aboriginal conditions was by uttering its cry until it approached or by coming upon a deer by accident. The best way to kill deer that I know of is to station men along the river bank and kill the deer when it is driven into the water by dogs. This seems possible even without canoes,[19] but I never saw or heard of its being done by the Kaingáng. Such a technique requires long residence in one place and a knowledge of the places where the deer will probably enter the water when it is driven by the dogs. Under aboriginal conditions deer were always killed by lone hunters. The only *tateti* hunts that I know of were cooperative, and this seems the best arrangement. Birds are not snared but are hunted individually.

Thus, for the most part, hunting techniques are fundamentally affected by the natural conditions of the forest. The hunting of tapir and deer by the waiting technique requires not only a thorough knowledge of the territory but a considerable number of men so that one may be stationed on every *carreira*. Neither of these conditions could well be fulfilled under aboriginal conditions. In other words, natural conditions in hunting prevented the systematic following out of the social ideal of cooperative effort.

In the table most of the industries appear as "I," but some of the most important, like hunting and housebuilding, are both C and I, and the very important industry of raiding is entirely C. If we throw this evidence together with the general emphasis in social life we will see that in spite of the preponderance of the "I" industries Kaingáng culture is really not individualistic but is cooperative under all of the most important conditions of life. Indeed, Kaingáng culture is oriented toward a degree of cooperation unusual in a tribe having so few social forms. It is unnecessary to sum-

[19] Richard Lydekker's *The Royal Natural History*, Vol. II, p. 462, describes a tapir hunt witnessed by Carl Schomburgk in which just this technique was used.